OPINION 2011 (Case 3061)

Hemibagrus Bleeker, 1862 (Osteichthyes, Siluriformes), Bagrus nemurus Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1840, B. planiceps Valenciennes, 1840, B. flavus Bleeker, 1846 and B. sieboldii Bleeker, 1846: previous fixations of type specimens not to be set aside

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Osteichthyes; Siluriformes; catfish; BAGRIDAE; Hemibagrus; Hemibagrus flavus; Hemibagrus nemurus; Hemibagrus planiceps; Hemibagrus sieboldii.

Ruling

- (1) The previous fixations of type specimens for *Bagrus nemurus* Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1840, *B. planiceps* Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1840, *B. flavus* Bleeker, 1846 and *B. sieboldii* Bleeker, 1846 are not to be set aside.
- (2) The name *Hemibagrus* Bleeker, 1862 (gender: masculine), type species by original designation *Bagrus nemurus* Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1840 is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
- (3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
 - (a) *nemurus* Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1840, as published in the binomen *Bagrus nemurus* (specific name of the type species of *Hemibagrus* Bleeker, 1862);
 - (b) planiceps Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1840, as published in the binomen Bagrus planiceps and as defined by the lectotype RMNH 2939 in the Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Leiden, designated by Ng, Goh, Ng & Dodson (1999);
 - (c) flavus Bleeker, 1846, as published in the binomen Bagrus flavus;
 - (d) sieboldii Bleeker, 1846, as published in the binomen Bagrus sieboldii.

History of Case 3061

An application to stabilise the usage of the specific names of: (a) *Bagrus nemurus* Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1840 (type species of *Hemibagrus* Bleeker, 1862) by the designation of a single neotype for both *B. nemurus* and *B. sieboldii* Bleeker, 1846 and (b) *B. planiceps*, Valenciennes, 1840 by the designation of the lectotype of *B. planiceps* as the neotype of *B. flavus* Bleeker, 1846 was received from Drs H.H. Ng, Y.Y. Goh and P.K.L. Ng (*National University of Singapore, Singapore, Republic of Singapore*) and Julian Dodson (*Cité Universitaire, Québec, Canada*) on 22 August 1997. After correspondence the case, including information in (a) above, was published in BZN 56: 34–41 (March 1999). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals. The information in (b) above was added to Proposal 19(1)(a) in BZN 56: 40 by its inclusion on the second voting paper (1 March 2002).

A comment opposing the application was published in BZN 56: 200 (September 1999). A comment in support of the application was published in BZN 56: 271–272

(December 1999). The application was sent to the Commission for voting on 1 September 2000. The case received a majority of the votes cast but failed to reach the required two-thirds majority (13 votes in favour and seven against; four Commissioners did not vote).

On 1 March 2002 the application was submitted for a re-vote under the Bylaws. It was noted on the voting paper that further information on Bleeker type material involved in the case was given by Dr M.J.P. van Oijen (*Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Leiden, The Netherlands*) in BZN **56**: 200–201 (September 1999); this additional information does not affect the issues in the case. It was also noted that a lectotype for the nominal species Bagrus planiceps Valenciennes, 1840 (specimen RMNH 2939 in Leiden) was designated by Ng et al. in BZN 56: 38, and a lectotype for B. anisurus Valenciennes, 1840 (specimen RMNH 2956 in Leiden, not Paris as stated in BZN 56: 272) was designated by Kottelat in BZN 56: 272. The name B. planiceps has precedence over B. anisurus (para. 3 of the application). It was further noted that two Commissioners had commented on their voting papers in response to the original vote. Voting against, Calder commented: 'Inasmuch as nomenclatural stability and universality are not threatened to any significant degree in this case (the names of both species have been stable for more than 140 years), I see no clear need to use the plenary power to designate neotypes for Bagrus nemurus, B. flavus and B. sieboldii. Instead, it is my view that the authors could, if they see 'exceptional need' for neotype designations, proceed on their own as requested in paras. 19(1)(a), 19(1)(b) and 19(1)(c) by applying the provisions of Article 75. Based on the information provided in the application, no type material is in existence for B. nemurus (paras. 11–13, 17). The types of *B. flavus* 'can never be recognized with certainty' (para. 10). The same applies to *B. sieboldii* (the authors have noted in para. 17: 'Our revision of this species-group is seriously complicated by the absence of types'). The strongest case could be made for a neotype of *B. nemurus*, type species of the genus *Hemibagrus*'. Rosenberg commented: 'Based on current biological knowledge, the names involved are undoubted subjective synonyms. Since there currently are no taxonomic problems, there is no need for neotypes'.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 March 2002 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 56: 40 and in the voting paper. At the close of the voting period on 1 June 2002 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 16: Bock, Böhme, Bouchet, Cogger, Eschmeyer, Halliday, Lamas, Macpherson, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Mawatari, Ng, Nielsen, Papp, Patterson, Song

Negative votes – 10: Alonso-Zarazaga, Brothers, Evenhuis, Fortey, Kerzhner, Kraus, Minelli, Rosenberg, Štys and van Tol.

Calder abstained.

No vote was received from Dupuis.

The comments cited above were endorsed by Brothers, Calder, Papp and Štys.

Again, the required two thirds majority for use of the plenary power to set aside all previous fixations of type specimens for *Bagrus flavus*, *B. nemurus* and *B. sieboldii* and designate neotypes was not reached and therefore the existing type specimens are retained and accordingly the species-group names are added to Official Lists.